Appl. No. 10/519,732 Amdt. Dated December 6, 2006

Reply to Office action of October 6, 2006 Attorney Docket No. P14095-US1

EUS/J/P/06-2509

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 20 and 27. Applicant respectfully submits no

new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 20-33 are pending in the application.

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the

foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 20-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee

(US 6,161,008). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the currently

pending claims.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the Lee reference does not identically

disclose all the elements recited in claim 20, as amended. More specifically, the Lee

reference does not identically disclose: (a) receiving a service-related event related to

said message at a server after said message has been sent; (b) selecting a target

access device regardless of whether or not a sender of said message subscribes to

said messaging service; and (c) performing all the recited steps at the server.

First, the interaction between the user application resident on the user's device

and the server application disclosed in the Lee reference takes place before the user

application sends the message (e.g., col. 15, lines 19-38). The Lee reference does not

identically disclose receiving a service-related event related to said message at a server

after said message has been sent as recited in claim 20, as amended. As a result, the

Lee reference does not identically disclose each and every element recited in claim 20,

as amended, and is, therefore, allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Second, the calling user in the Lee reference must be a subscriber to the service

and have the user application resident on his/her device or a gateway associated with

his/her device (col. 21, lines 4-17). The Lee reference does not identically disclose

selecting a target access device regardless of whether or not a sender of said message

subscribes to said messaging service as recited in claim 20, as amended. As a result,

Page 6 of 8

Appl. No. 10/519,732 Amdt. Dated December 6, 2006 Reply to Office action of October 6, 2006 Attorney Docket No. P14095-US1 EUS/J/P/06-2509

the Lee reference does not identically disclose each and every element recited in claim 20, as amended, and is, therefore, allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Third, the personal mobility system disclosed in the Lee reference requires the use of a user application resident on the user's device (or a gateway associated with the user's device) to perform the service functions <u>and</u> a server application (e.g., col. 2, lines 27-44; col. 6, line 55-col. 7, line 30; col. 12, lines 54-65; Figures 2, 5 and 6). In addition, any formatting changes to the messages are made by the calling user's user application (col. 21, lines 25-42). The Lee reference does not identically disclose performing all the recited steps <u>at the server</u> recited in claim 20, as amended. As a result, the Lee reference does not identically disclose each and every element recited in claim 20, as amended, and is, therefore, allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Whereas claim 27 recites limitations analogous to those of claim 20, it is also not anticipated by Lee. Furthermore, whereas claims 23-26 and 28-33 are dependent from claims 20 and 27, respectively, and include the limitations thereof, those claims are also patentable.

3.) Prior Art Not Relied Upon

In paragraph 6 on page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure.

Appl. No. 10/519,732 Amdt. Dated December 6, 2006 Reply to Office action of October 6, 2006 Attorney Docket No. P14095-US1 EUS/J/P/06-2509

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Cameron

Registration No. 50,298

Date: December 6, 2006

Ericsson Inc. 6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11 Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-4145 michael.cameron@ericsson.com